

REMARKS

In this Amendment, Applicant has amended Claims 31, 35, 46, 49 and 50, and added Claim 51 to overcome the rejections and further specify the embodiments of the present invention. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter has been introduced by the amended claims. All claims are now present for examination and favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the preceding amendments and the following comments.

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT:

In the Office Action of June 24, 2009, the Examiner refused to consider the references listed in the Information Disclosure Statement (“IDS”) submitted on December 8, 2006 because it allegedly did not include a concise explanation of the relevance of the references.

It is respectfully submitted that the cited references should have been considered because the required concise explanation was provided in the International Search Report (“ISR”) submitted together with the IDS on December 8, 2006. A copy of the ISR was enclosed with the IDS. More specifically, the reference AG (DE 20116344) was identified with “Y” in the ISR. According to MPEP 609.04(a)(III), the concise explanation “may be ... merely an ‘X’, ‘Y’, or ‘A’ indication on a search report.” Further, as explained on first page of the IDS statement, the references AD-AF are discussed on pages 1 – 2 of the specification of the present application. These discussions satisfy the concise explanation requirement.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to consider the references listed on the IDS.